

**SEATTLE HOUSING AUTHORITY'S
HOLLY PARK RELOCATION EFFORTS
APRIL 1, 2003**

Auditor-in-Charge: Sterling Leibenguth

**City Auditor: Susan Cohen
Deputy City Auditor: David G Jones**

City of Seattle

700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2410
Seattle, Washington 98104-5030



Printed on Recycled Paper



Office of City Auditor Memorandum

DATE: April 1, 2003

TO: Councilmember Richard McIver

FROM: Susan Cohen, City Auditor

SUBJECT: Seattle Housing Authority's Holly Park Relocation Efforts

Over the past six years, the Seattle Housing Authority has been replacing low-income public housing units in Seattle's Holly Park Community with a mixed-income community known as NewHolly. When this revitalization project is completed, NewHolly will consist of a mixture of public housing residents, and households that either buy or rent at market rates. In 1997, the City of Seattle approved the Holly Park redevelopment plan, contributed \$15 million to the \$170 million project, and entered into a Memorandum of Agreement with the project's developer—the Seattle Housing Authority. The Agreement requires, among other things, that the Seattle Housing Authority provide adequate relocation choices and minimize the displacement and disruption of Holly Park households during the project.

With the Holly Park project nearing completion and two other Seattle Housing Authority revitalization projects—Rainier Vista and High Point—in progress, we initiated a review to determine whether the Housing Authority established and implemented policies and procedures that contributed to the satisfactory relocation of the Holly Park households affected by the project.

We addressed the following questions:

- Were Holly Park households given adequate and timely information about relocation choices, assistance, and benefits?
- Were Holly Park households provided adequate time and counseling to make informed relocation choices?
- Did Holly Park households receive moving compensation as required, and were the moves coordinated to minimize disruption?
- How successful was the Seattle Housing Authority in providing the preferred housing choices elected by Holly Park households?

RESULTS IN BRIEF

The Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) developed and followed a Holly Park Relocation Plan that guided the Holly Park relocation effort, and tracked each household's relocation progress in a relocation case file. After reviewing a representative sample of 59 Holly Park relocation cases,¹ we determined that SHA followed the Relocation Plan's required steps, and met the relocation conditions specified in the Memorandum of Agreement between the Housing Authority and the City of Seattle.

Our review consisted of looking for evidence that each household in our sample received advance notice and information about the project and its impact, counseling to help make relocation choices, interpretive services when necessary, advance notice of required moves, and moving assistance and compensation for moving expenses. The evidence documenting these steps was not always present in the relocation files, and tracking down some of these documents dating back to 1996 and 1997 depended in large part on the institutional memory of longtime SHA employees and searching through records at other SHA office locations.

The Seattle Housing Authority did not survey Holly Park households to determine their satisfaction with the relocation process or to identify improvements needed for future relocation efforts such as Rainier Vista or High Point. However, an SHA official said that they plan to administer a customer satisfaction survey of 100 Holly Park relocated residents in April 2003, and that a customer survey had been implemented for the Rainier Vista relocation project.

About 70 percent (538) of the Holly Park households eligible for relocation benefits relocated to their first preference for housing. This measure increases to 85 percent (659) if the criterion for achieving first preference for housing includes the 121 households that did not relocate to their first preference because:

- They changed their choice due to health issues that required they move to a supportive living environment (25); or
- They exercised their eligibility to return to NewHolly rental units when they were unable to achieve homeownership (86); or
- They achieved homeownership, even though this was not their first preference (10).

The Seattle Housing Authority helped most of the remaining households to either relocate to SHA-managed housing outside of NewHolly (33); or to managed housing outside SHA's jurisdiction (33); or to housing subsidized by federal Section 8 housing vouchers to help keep rent at 30 percent or less of income (27).

BACKGROUND

In 1997, after three years of planning and public debate, an SHA-proposed Holly Park redevelopment plan was finalized and approved by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Seattle City Council. Under the SHA plan, an estimated \$170–\$180 million in federal, state, and local money would be spent to demolish the Holly Park public housing project, and build a mixed-income neighborhood to include about 400 units for very low-income households (below 50 percent of median income); 400 units for low-income families (between 50–80 percent of median income); and 400 market rate units. The redevelopment is taking place in three phases to accommodate as many residents as possible on-site throughout the multiyear project, and is scheduled to be completed by 2007. As of October 2002, the

¹ See Attachment I for a description of the representative sample.

Phase I and II housing units were nearly completed and fully occupied. Furthermore, the Phase III units were vacated and demolished to prepare the site for construction beginning in 2003.

The City of Seattle agreed to contribute a total of \$15 million to Holly Park's Phases I, II, and III. The City and SHA entered into a May 2000 Second Amended and Restated Memorandum of Agreement that established terms and conditions for the use of City funds, provided replacement-housing targets, and relocation guidelines for Holly Park families affected by the project. The relocation guidelines state that SHA should minimize displacement of families and individuals from their homes and neighborhoods, and provide relocation assistance (moving expenses) for those who must move because their unit is being demolished. The guidelines also call for SHA to adhere to a HUD- approved Holly Park Relocation Plan to ensure the following for every family living at Holly Park:

- Minimal displacement during the demolition of existing Holly Park units and the three-phase multiyear construction of new units in NewHolly;
- Counseling in the family's native language;
- A wide-range offering of relocation options;
- Relocation at SHA's expense.

Households living at Holly Park as of May 31, 1996 (832 households), were eligible for relocation benefits and assistance.

The Holly Park Relocation Plan gave every eligible household the choice of either a permanent move from Holly Park or a temporary move to remaining Holly Park units while awaiting the completion of new units. Those electing a permanent move were given three relocation housing options: 1) relocation to a similar housing unit in another SHA-managed community; 2) relocation to an apartment in assisted housing managed by a housing authority outside SHA's jurisdiction; or 3) a Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher. Households could use the Section 8 voucher to rent modest-cost units of their choice in the private market, with the requirement that they pay 30 percent of their adjusted income for rent and utilities, with a government subsidy (voucher) for the balance of costs up to a locally determined maximum. Households electing a temporary move could choose to return to the low-income rental opportunities at NewHolly and/or apply for assistance to attain homeownership. The Holly Park Relocation Plan required that all those electing a temporary move participate in a lottery drawing to establish the order in which households would be offered completed NewHolly units. The first Holly Park relocation was completed on April 2, 1996, and the most recent move was completed on February 14, 2002—a nearly six-year period.

FINDINGS

SHA provided Holly Park households adequate information and counseling to make informed relocation choices

The Seattle Housing Authority developed and followed a formal plan for vacating and reoccupying Holly Park during its redevelopment. The Holly Park Relocation Plan, finalized in August 1996, established a blueprint for administering the Holly Park relocation effort that was consistent with the conditions set forth in the Memorandum of Agreement between SHA and the City. The Plan clarified who was eligible for relocation assistance, identified housing relocation options, specified moving benefits and compensation, and provided a schedule for the redevelopment with potential moving dates and advance notice-to-move requirements.

Holly Park households eligible for relocation were provided a condensed but detailed version of the Relocation Plan as part of a Relocation Information Packet that also included fact sheets on housing choice

options and a relocation options worksheet. SHA also scheduled multiple workshops to help residents better understand their relocation options. For example, in September 1996 four separate information workshops were held, with childcare provided, at the Holly Park Community Center. The workshops provided residents the opportunity to receive additional information packets, hear firsthand from SHA presenters about household relocation rights, and speak in their native language with trained SHA counselors about housing choice options.² After the workshops, SHA scheduled individual residents to meet privately with a relocation counselor to make a binding relocation choice. According to SHA officials, at this meeting an interpreter fluent in the native language of the resident was present. The entire relocation process was outlined, detailed relocation options were provided, and moving rights and expenses were explained. At the conclusion of these meetings, the household and SHA officials signed a binding document indicating the household's relocation decision.

We reviewed a representative sample of 59 Holly Park relocation case files to determine how well SHA followed the Relocation Plan. The relocation files are intended to provide a history of the relocation actions for each household, and contain documentation verifying that specific actions detailed in the Relocation Plan were taken. Overall, we found sufficient documentation in the files to verify that SHA followed the steps specified in the Relocation Plan. For example, the relocation files or other tenant files contained documentation demonstrating that Holly Park households were notified by certified letter of the redevelopment project and their eligibility for relocation assistance, provided detailed information and counseling on their relocation rights and choice options, and when English was not their primary language translators were available. In addition, we found advance notice-to-move letters, actual move date records, and some evidence (either a check or summary) of compensation provided to households for the move.

Holly Park households received moving compensation as called for in the Relocation Plan

Holly Park residents received \$1.22 million for moving assistance and other costs associated with relocation.³ Compensation was based on the type of move and the household's size. For example, households that elected to return to NewHolly but had to move temporarily to another Holly Park unit during construction, were moved by a resident moving business and could receive a \$50 dislocation allowance, plus reimbursement for any utility reconnection costs. Households that moved permanently to non-Holly Park rental units had the options of being moved by the resident moving business, accepting a fixed-lump sum moving payment ranging from \$750 to \$1,200 based on the household size, or receiving payment for actual moving expenses. We reviewed 59 relocation files and financial records and found that the payments for each of the 59 moves were consistent with the Relocation Plan's requirements for the type of move and household size.

SHA reported that households moving to permanent or temporary rental units received an average of about \$1,400 in relocation benefits. SHA also offered a moving expense reimbursement and investment package of \$5,250 to those households seeking homeownership. A total of 46 Holly Park households successfully achieved homeownership and took advantage of this package by receiving a total of about \$241,000.

Holly Park household moves were coordinated to minimize disruption

The Holly Park Relocation Plan called for the demolition of all Holly Park units, which meant that all 832 relocation eligible households had to move sometime during the project. SHA planned the new construction in three separate building phases and established relocation priorities to minimize the number

² Holly Park represented a diverse community with residents speaking 19 different languages. SHA Holly Park employees or contracted interpreters provided interpretive services to all non-English-speaking Holly Park residents.

³ Several Service Provider Agencies under lease to SHA and located at Holly Park also received relocation compensation for temporary moves and were compensated for costs associated with meeting Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) access requirements.

and impact of moves for Holly Park residents. We found that SHA's use of the phased-construction approach and its consistent implementation of the Relocation Plan priorities resulted in the minimum number of moves for most households.

SHA minimized household moves by making two key decisions early in the planning process. First, SHA's revitalization plan specified that the NewHolly Community would be built in three separate phases, which provided SHA with the flexibility to allow occupancy of existing or new units during the two phases not under reconstruction. Second, SHA's Relocation Policy and Procedures stated that households, whose relocation choice was to relocate permanently from Holly Park, must move before the start of Phase I redevelopment in July 1997. These households included residents with Section 8 housing vouchers, other SHA community housing, or other off-site assisted housing. A total of 382 Holly Park households elected to move permanently from Holly Park. In our review of 59 relocation cases, we found that all 21 of the households that chose to move permanently from Holly Park moved before July 1997. According to SHA, through March 2002, a total of 1,135 relocations were completed for the 832 Holly Park eligible households (an average of 1.4 moves per household).

Our review of 59 household relocation files revealed that the number of relocation moves varied considerably based on the relocation choice. For example, we found that all 21 of the households in our sample who elected to move permanently from Holly Park had only one relocation move and their relocations were completed by May 1997. These results are consistent with the Relocation Plan's requirements.

On the other hand, we found that only four of the 18 sampled households that elected to return to NewHolly made only one move, while the remaining 14 made as many as two to four relocation moves. The higher number of relocations for those electing to return to NewHolly was consistent with the nature of the three-phase reconstruction effort and the fact that those electing to return to NewHolly were given priority to remain at NewHolly during the reconstruction. The combination of these two factors contributed to most of the 257 households electing a return to NewHolly to move more than once within the Holly Park Community during reconstruction. For example, one of the households in our survey that lived in a Phase I location moved to a unit in Phase II while Phase I was under construction, then moved to a Phase III unit when construction began on Phase II, and finally moved back to a Phase I location when a new unit that met the family's needs became available.

Eighty-five percent of Holly Park households either obtained their first preference for final relocation housing, moved to a supportive living environment due to health issues, or returned to a NewHolly rental unit

SHA offered five types of housing options for the 832 Holly Park households that were to be relocated. The five types were:

1. Moving back to completed NewHolly rental units;
2. Homeownership;
3. Moving to private rental housing utilizing a federal HUD Section 8 housing choice voucher to subsidize rent payments;
4. Moving to an apartment at another SHA-managed community; and
5. Moving to assisted housing managed by a housing authority outside of Seattle.

Holly Park households were allowed to express their relocation preference after a nearly two-month education and counseling period conducted by the SHA during the fall of 1996.

SHA summarized the relocation outcomes for the 832 households living in Holly Park in an April 2002 Holly Park Relocation Outcome Report. In our review of this SHA report, we found that only 776 Holly Park households made relocation choices and retained eligibility for relocation throughout the relocation process. Fifty-six of the total 832 Holly Park households eligible for relocation chose either to not elect a relocation first preference (30); lost eligibility due to lease violations (10); or died before making a relocation choice (16). The report also shows that 538 (about 70 percent) of the 776 households that made choices and retained eligibility, successfully relocated to the type of housing they elected as their first preference. The number of households achieving first preference for the five relocation preferences is shown below in Exhibit 1 (Note: a summary comparing relocation housing choices to actual outcomes is found in Appendix II).

Exhibit 1

Households First Preference for Final Relocation	Number of Households That Achieved Their First Preference (776 Eligible)
Return to NewHolly Rental Unit	157
Homeownership ⁴	34
Section 8 Housing Voucher for Private Housing	237
SHA Communities and Scattered Sites	73
Other Assisted Non-SHA Housing	37
Total	538 (69.3%)

SHA's almost 70 percent success rate in matching households with their preferred housing outcome increases to 85 percent if three additional factors are considered. The first factor was the declining health of certain residents that forced them to move into supportive living environments such as nursing homes or assisted-living facilities. A total of 25 households whose first preference was homeownership or return to NewHolly, had to move to supportive living environments during the construction of NewHolly.

The second factor that contributed to lower first-preference success rates was the optimism shown by the 166 Holly Park households who chose homeownership as their preferred relocation outcome. If residents wanted this preference, they were free to choose it, without having to meet any prequalifying standards. According to SHA's Holly Park Relocation Director, the relocation planners initially expected only about 12 of the 166 households that elected homeownership as their final relocation outcome to successfully achieve that outcome. SHA officials told us that recognizing the special nature of this choice, residents were counseled on two points: 1) If they chose homeownership as their preferred outcome, they were required to stay at Holly Park during the revitalization project and participate in a special homeownership education program; and 2) If they were unable to achieve their goal of homeownership, they would be offered a new rental unit at NewHolly. A total of 86 households whose first preference was homeownership exercised their option to accept an SHA rental unit in NewHolly.

The third factor that could raise the successful outcome measure was the ten households whose initial preferred outcome was to return to NewHolly, but in the end achieved homeownership.

Of the 117 households that did not achieve their first preference for relocation, 33 relocated to rental units in other SHA-managed assets in Seattle; 33 relocated to assisted housing managed by housing authorities outside Seattle; 27 relocated to housing subsidized by federal Section 8 vouchers; and the outcome of 24 households is unknown.

SHA officials believe that some of the 117 households who did not achieve their preferred final relocation outcome should also be perceived as achieving successful relocation outcomes. For example, SHA officials

⁴ At the time of our audit, all of these homes were outside NewHolly.

stated that the success rate should be higher because many of the 117 households either changed their preference or were actually offered a unit that met their initial preference, but rejected it. We agree with SHA that preference changes or rejected offers by households should be taken into account in calculating the final relocation success rate. However, in our review of the 59 sampled NewHolly relocation files, we did not find any evidence showing that SHA had received and recorded a household request for changing a preference or declining a unit that met its preferred outcome. We requested that SHA provide written evidence of changes for eight households we identified in our sample that elected homeownership or return to NewHolly, but ended living in different places. While SHA provided 17 forms signed by Holly Park households requesting preference changes, none represented the eight households we requested. An SHA official said that of the eight households, one lost eligibility due to a lease violation and the remaining seven changed their preferences: one elected to move before construction started on Phase I units, two elected to move to a supportive living environment with family, one moved to Bothell to be closer to work, and three moved off-site because they either did not like the NewHolly unit offered or did not want to wait until NewHolly units were completed. However, the SHA official said these reasons were from her memory. We did not obtain supporting documentation related to the eight households before the completion of our audit work. If SHA wants these changes to be considered when computing the preferred outcome success rate, such evidence should be included in the relocation files.

Holly Park Relocation files are not complete

According to SHA Holly Park relocation officials, the individual relocation file maintained for each of the 832 eligible Holly Park households is intended to provide a complete record of the relocation actions from the first notice of the planned project to the elected relocation choice to the final move.

During our review of the 59 sampled relocation files, we found that documentation was missing from about 20 percent (12 of 59) of the files for one or more of the steps specified in the Holly Park Relocation Plan. For example, we found that some files lacked verification of household eligibility, others did not include a record of the certified letter notifying individual households of Holly Park's redevelopment and their need to make relocation choices, some did not include a letter giving advance notice of the need to move. In addition, some files did not contain a record of the moving compensation payment, making it difficult to confirm the amount of compensation received. However, in all instances in which the verification information described above was missing, NewHolly staff or SHA staff in other departments located the missing documentation for us in separate tenant files or in files maintained at other SHA office locations. Also, as noted above, we found no evidence supporting any requested changes in an outcome preference in the files of eight households that SHA told us elected to change their preferred relocation outcome. Because many of the missing documents were generated in 1996 and 1997, the effort to find them was time consuming and success depended in large part on the institutional memory of longtime SHA employees. Finding the documentation for one missing moving-compensation payment record required SHA staff to recover a canceled check from a 1999 bank reconciliation statement.

Holly Park households had few formal complaints or grievances

The SHA Relocation Plan provided to Holly Park households described the grievance process if households had a complaint about the implementation of their relocation. In our review of the 59 relocation files, we found no complaints, grievances, or notations by any of the households regarding inadequate information, insufficient counseling, unfair treatment, disappointment with relocation results, or other issues.

According to SHA officials, there were only two formal complaints filed during the entire NewHolly redevelopment and relocation process. After reviewing documents and speaking with SHA officials about both complaints, we concluded that they were resolved in a satisfactory way. The first complaint cited damages to household items by SHA's contracted mover who refused to pay for damaged goods. SHA officials intervened on behalf of the household, and the mover eventually paid the requested amount. The

second complaint was more serious and involved an elderly occupant who refused to move from a unit that was scheduled for demolition. According to a SHA official, a relative of the occupant was contacted and flew to Seattle at SHA's expense. During mediations, the relative agreed the relocation was appropriate. However, the relative was unable to convince the family member to vacate nor was the relative able to convey the merits of SHA's proposed senior housing alternative. As a last measure, SHA went to court and secured a court order for the move and the relocation was completed.

SHA did not conduct a survey to determine how satisfied Holly Park households were with the relocation process and their relocation outcome. According to SHA's Holly Park Relocation Property Manager, a customer survey of the Holly Park relocation process was not contemplated during the planning stages for that effort. However, he said a customer survey was designed and had been used for the Rainier Vista relocations. The Rainier Vista survey has been completed by households relocated for the first phase of that project and the results were posted on the SHA Web site.

To develop a sense of household satisfaction with the relocation process, we surveyed a selected sample of 14 Holly Park households who participated in the relocation. We received only four responses to our mailings and follow-up phone calls. Overall, the four attributed good marks to SHA. They were satisfied with relocation rights and benefits information, and believed that they were given sufficient time and counseling to indicate a relocation outcome preference and adequate time to prepare for moves. In addition, three expressed satisfaction or great satisfaction with their present living arrangement. One respondent expressed dissatisfaction with the current living arrangement because the rent was too high, and hoped to return to NewHolly after SHA completes Phase III.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SHA's Holly Park relocation actions appear to be consistent with the intent and details contained in the Memorandum of Agreement with the City of Seattle. SHA's Relocation Plan provided both the road map for implementation by housing officials and the detailed information needed by affected households to make informed relocation choices. The effectiveness of the plan and its implementation by SHA staff is evident in the high percentage of the 832 Holly Park households who achieved their preferred relocation choice, the 52 households that achieved homeownership, and only two complaints or grievances filed.

However, while the relocation outcomes are clearly documented, the documentation of the individual steps taken to achieve the outcome was not always present in the relocation files maintained for each Holly Park household. Many files we reviewed had complete documentation for relocation actions taken; however, some lacked documentation for one or more actions and required intensive searches of other tenant files and SHA Finance Department files to locate the documentation. The individual relocation file is the one place where the complete history of all relocation events and actions can be documented. Maintaining a complete record of all actions in one place helps SHA establish its accountability to the City, the public, and the interest groups, which are all monitoring SHA's actions. In addition, SHA needs feedback from the households participating in the relocations at Holly Park and the new revitalization efforts at Rainier Vista and High Point to help gauge the success of these revitalization projects. By not surveying Holly Park households shortly after their relocation, SHA missed an opportunity to reassess its approach and make process improvements.

We recommend that SHA's Executive Director establish procedures to ensure that: 1) all relocation actions are fully documented in each file maintained for individual households participating in any future relocation projects; and 2) SHA conducts surveys of all households participating in future relocation efforts to determine their satisfaction with the process.

SHA COMMENTS

In their written response to this report, SHA management stated that they agreed with all of the conclusions contained in our audit. SHA management said they appreciated the care and thoroughness with which our staff completed its work. They said this clearly demonstrated the commitment of the City to ensure that the residents of SHA's redeveloping HOPE VI⁵ communities receive careful attention in order to mitigate the difficulties of relocation.

SHA management also appreciated the opportunity to demonstrate through this audit SHA's commitment to the relocation process. Recognizing that relocation is a stressful and difficult event in the lives of residents, SHA management said that SHA attempted to complete the relocation at Holly Park in a sensitive and expeditious manner.

SHA offered the following comments on our recommendations:

1. They recognize the importance of maintaining accurate and consistent files, and have taken steps to ensure that files for future relocations contain all of the appropriate documentation. Careful file maintenance was challenging with the Holly Park process because the management office was moved twice during relocation. Also, staff was sometimes uncertain as to whether a specific document should be filed in the tenant's rental file or in the relocation file. SHA has already implemented new filing protocols at Rainier Vista and High Point, along with additional staff training, to resolve this issue.
2. SHA agrees that there is much to be gained by surveying residents about their relocation experience. They implemented resident surveys during Rainier Vista and High Point relocation. They are also planning a follow-up survey for former Holly Park residents in the spring of 2003.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The scope of this review was limited to an examination of SHA's compliance with relocation provisions contained in the May 2000 Second Amended and Restated Memorandum of Agreement with the City of Seattle for the 832 households in the Holly Park redevelopment project. The methodology primarily consisted of interviews with SHA officials, review of reports and data contained in SHA's Holly Park Relocation Outcomes database, and a review of a sample of the 832 individual household case files documenting relocation actions. Further details on our scope and methodology are found in Attachment I.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me at 233-1093. To improve our work, we invite you to complete and return the evaluation form at the back of this report.

SC:DGJ:SL:tlb

Attachment I

Attachment II

⁵ HOPE VI is a federal program to improve severely distressed public housing.

ATTACHMENT I

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The scope of this review was limited to an examination of the Seattle Housing Authority's (SHA) compliance with relocation provisions contained in the May 2000 Second Amended and Restated Memorandum of Agreement with the City of Seattle for the 832 households in the Holly Park redevelopment project. The methodology primarily consisted of interviews with SHA officials, review of reports and data contained in SHA's Holly Park Relocation Outcomes database, and a review of a sample of the 832 individual household case files documenting relocation actions. Specifically:

- To determine whether households were given adequate and timely policy information about their relocation choices, assistance, and benefits, we identified Holly Park relocation policies, interviewed SHA officials to evaluate how policy and procedure information was made available to households, reviewed available complaint files/records, and examined the 59 individual household case files to confirm that SHA consistently provided and documented the information.
- To determine whether households were provided adequate time and counseling to make informed relocation choices, we identified the time frames established for notification and decision-making, interviewed SHA officials to verify that language interpretation was provided, reviewed available complaint files/records, and examined the 59 individual household case files to check whether adequate time and interpretation were provided and documented by SHA. In addition, we sent questionnaires to 14 of the 59 households and asked them to tell us whether they received the time, counseling, information, and interpretive services specified in the Holly Park Relocation Plan. We also made follow-up telephone calls to some of the 14 households.
- To determine whether households were compensated as required and moves were coordinated to minimize disruption, we reviewed SHA policy to identify a household-moving expense schedule, interviewed SHA officials to obtain criteria for minimizing moves, reviewed available complaint files/records, and examined the 59 individual household case files to check whether payments and move criteria were consistently applied.
- To determine the relocation outcomes for Holly Park households as of April 2002, we used the SHA Holly Park Relocation Outcomes database that contains information pertaining to all relocation decisions, actions, and outcomes for the 832 Holly Park participating households. We tested the reliability of the database by matching the final relocation outcome recorded in the database to the outcome written on the source document in a representative sample of 59 individual household relocation files. We found two cases where this key data point was incorrectly recorded in the database. Because of the two errors we are 95 percent confident that the upper-limit error rate for this data point was 10 percent.

ATTACHMENT II

SUMMARY COMPARING RELOCATION HOUSING CHOICES TO ACTUAL OUTCOMES

			Actual Outcomes ⁶						
			(Underlined number denotes first preference achieved)						
Relocation Choice	# First Preference	# Deceased or Not Eligible	Home-ownership	New - Holly Rental	Section 8	SHA ⁷	Other ⁸	Living Support	Un-known
Home-ownership	166	8	<u>34</u> ⁹	86	6	7	19	3	3
Return to NewHolly Rental	254	13	10 ⁹	<u>157</u>	21	11	14	22	6
Section 8 Voucher	255	-	-	-	<u>237</u>	12	-	-	6
SHA Community or SHA Off-Site	76	2	-	-	-	<u>73</u>	-	-	1
Other than SHA Assisted Housing	51	3	<u>2</u>	-	<u>2</u>	3	<u>30</u>	<u>3</u>	8
No Choice	30	1	-	-	1	24	2	-	2
TOTALS	832	(27)	46	243	267	130	65	28	26

⁶ Underlined numbers indicate success.

⁷ SHA includes SHA's inventory of high-rise/garden/and off-site housing.

⁸ Other includes subsidized housing through housing authorities located outside the City of Seattle.

⁹ At the time of our audit, all of these homes were outside NewHolly.

Office of City Auditor's Report Evaluation Form

FAX...MAIL...CALL...
HELP US SERVE THE CITY BETTER

Our mission at the Office of City Auditor is to help assist the City in achieving honest, efficient management and full accountability throughout the City government. We service the public interest by providing the Mayor, the City Council and City managers with accurate information, unbiased analysis, and objective recommendations on how best to use public resources in support of the well-being of the citizens of Seattle.

Your feedback helps us do a better job. If you could please take a few minutes to fill out the following information for us, it will help us assess and improve our work.

* * * * *

Report: **Seattle Housing Authority's Holly Park Relocation Efforts**

Release Date: April 1, 2003

Please rate the following elements of this report by checking the appropriate box:

	Too Little	Just Right	Too Much
Background Information			
Details			
Length of Report			
Clarity of Writing			
Potential Impact			

Suggestions for our report format: _____

Suggestions for future studies: _____

Other comments, thoughts, ideas: _____

Name (Optional):

Thanks for taking the time to help us.

Fax: 206/684-0900

E-Mail: auditor@seattle.gov

Mail: Office of City Auditor, 700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2410, Seattle, WA 98104-5030

Call: Susan Cohen, City Auditor, 206-233-3801

www.cityofseattle.net/audit/